APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,640	09/15/2003	Hideya Kawahara	SUN04-0196-JLM	1906

57960 7590 08/11/2006	EXAMINER	
SUN MICROSYSTEMS INC.	PENDER, JOSHUA	
C/O PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP		
2820 FIFTH STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DAVIS, CA 95618-7759	2179	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/663,640	KAWAHARA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua Pender	2179	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/3/05 5/27/04*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 5, 6, 11, 17, 18, 23, 29, 30, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "can involve; can include; can accept" recited in claims 5, 6, 11, 17, 18, 23, 24, 30, 35 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 10-11, 13-15, 22-23, 25-27, 34-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robertson et al (WO 00/60442) herein after referred as to Robertson.

As to claim 25, Robertson discloses an apparatus that manipulates a window

within a three-dimensional (3D) display model [p.12 lines 16-22], comprising:

displaying a view into the 3D display model [p.12-task gallery] through a two-

dimensional (2D) display [figure 47]; receiving a command to manipulate the

window within the 3D display model [p.17 lines 29-30, p.18 lines 1-3], wherein

the window provides a 2D user interface for a 2D application [p. 12 lines 16-

22]; and in response to the command, manipulating the window within the 3D

display model so that the manipulation is visible within the 2D display [Figs 8A

& 8B, p.22 lines 11-22].

As to claim 37, Robertson discloses a means for manipulating a window within

a three-dimensional (3D) display model [p.12 lines 16-22], comprising:

displaying a view into the 3D display model [p.12-task gallery] through a two-

dimensional (2D) display [figure 47]; receiving a command to manipulate the

window within the 3D display model [p.17 lines 29-30, p.18 lines 1-3], wherein

the window provides a 2D user interface for a 2D application [p.12 lines 16-22];

and in response to the command, manipulating the window within the 3D

display model so that the manipulation is visible within the 2D display [Figs 8A

& 8B, p.22 lines 11-22].

As to claim 26, Robertson discloses the apparatus of claim 25, wherein if the

command moves the window in close proximity to an edge of the 2D display,

the method further comprises tilting the window so that the window appears at

an oblique angle in the 2D display [Fig 12B p.23 lines 4-13, p.24 lines 1-3],

whereby the contents of the window remain visible [Fig. 10B], while the window

occupies less space in the 2D display and is less likely to overlap other

windows [Fig 6].

As to claim 27, Robertson discloses the apparatus of claim 26, wherein if the

window is selected [p.20 lines 28-30], the method further comprises untilting

the window so that the window is parallel with the 2D display [Fig 12D and 12E

p.24 lines 9-17].

As to claim 34, Robertson discloses the apparatus of claim 25, wherein if the

command is entered through a pointing device [p.17 lines 29-30 and p.18 lines

1-3] and the command throws the window by moving the window quickly and

releasing it [shown by drag and drop p. 20 lines 25-30 p.21 lines 1-3], the

method further comprises throwing the window by moving the window in a

continuous animated motion [shown by drag and drop p. 20 lines 25-30 p.21

lines 1-3].

As to claim 35, Robertson discloses the apparatus of claim 34, wherein

throwing the window [shown by drag and drop p. 20 lines 25-30 p.21 lines 1-3].

can involve: locating the window farther from the viewpoint [p. 20 lines 25-30

p.21 lines 1-26].; scaling down the size of the window; iconizing the window; and deleting the window.

Claims 1-3 differ from claims 25-27 only in that claims 1-3 are method claims whereas, claims 25-27 are apparatus claims. Thus, claims 1-3 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 25-27 above.

Claims 10-11 differ from claims 34-35 only in that claims 10-11 are method claims whereas, claims 34-35 are apparatus claims. Thus, claims 10-11 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 34-35 above.

Claims 13-15 differ from claims 25-27 only in that claims 13-15 are directed to a computer readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a computer cause to perform the same method as claims 25-27. Thus, claims 13-15 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 25-27 above.

Claims 22-23 differ from claims 34-35 only in that claims 22-23 are directed to a computer readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a computer cause to perform the same method as claims 34-35. Thus, claims 22-23 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 34-35 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 7, 19, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Robertson in view of Horvitz (US 6,016,145)

As to claim 31, note the discussion of Robertson above, Robertson does not

teach wherein if the command is to minimize the window, the window

manipulation mechanism is configured to: tilt the window so that a spine

located on a side edge of the window is visible and the contents of the window

remains visible, wherein the spine contains identification information for the

window; and to move the minimized window to an edge of the 2D display;

wherein the operations of turning and moving the window are animated as a

continuous motion. Horvitz teaches wherein if the command is to minimize the

window [Horvitz column 12 lines 63-67 column 13 line 1 Fig.3], manipulating

the window involves: tilting the window so that a spine located on a side edge

of the window is visible and the contents of the window remains visible [Horvitz

column 12 lines 20-25 also Fig.3], wherein the spine contains identification

information for the window [Horvitz item 62]; and moving the minimized window

to an edge of the 2D display [Horvitz columns 12 line 63-column 13 lines 9];

wherein the operations of turning and moving the window are animated as a

continuous motion [column 4 lines 23-26]. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

placement of the title bar on the side of a window taught by Horvitz to tilting a

window taught by Robertson because it is an enhanced system for displaying

multiple applications or windows as simulated three-dimensional objects on a

computer display screen [Horvitz column 3 lines 8-10].

Claim 7 differ from claim 31 only in that claim 7 is a method claim of the same

apparatus as claim 31. Thus, claim 7 is analyzed as previously discussed with

respect to claim 31 above.

Claim 19 differ from claim 31 only in that claim 19 is directed to a computer

readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a

computer cause to perform the same method as claim 31. Thus, claim 19 is

analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 31 above.

6.Claim 8-9, 20-21, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Robertson in view of Zhu et al (PG-Pub #US

2003/0220973).

As to claim 32, note the discussion of Robertson above, Robertson does not teach receive a predefined gesture through a pointing device, and in response to the predefined gesture, to minimize a top-level window in the 2D display, whereby repeating the predefined gesture causes subsequent top-level windows to be minimized. Zhu teaches receiving a predefined gesture [0975] through a pointing device [mouse [1379]], and in response to the predefined gesture [0975], minimizing a top-level window in the 2D display [0975], whereby repeating the predefined gesture causes subsequent top-level windows to be minimized [0975]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a gesture to minimize a window taught by Zhu with the 3D window manipulation system taught by Robertson because clicking the minimize button would remove a window from a screen [Zhu 0975].

As to claim 33, note the discussion of Robertson above, Robertson does not teach wherein upon receiving a window restoration command, the window manipulation mechanism is configured to restore minimized windows to their expanded state. Zhu teaches wherein upon receiving a window restoration command [Zhu 0976], the window manipulation mechanism is configured to restore minimized windows to their expanded state [Zhu 0976]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the restoration of the windows to their expanded state as taught by Zhu with the 3D window manipulation system taught by Robertson

as the restoration of the window enables the user to view the entire window as shown by Zhu paragraph 0976.

Claims 8-9 differ from claims 32-33 only in that claims 8-9 are method claims whereas, claims 32-33 are apparatus claims. Thus, claims 8-9 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 32-33 above.

Claims 20-21 differ from claims 32-33 only in that claims 20-21 are directed to a computer readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a computer cause to perform the same method as claims 32-33. Thus, claims 20-21 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 32-33 above.

7. Claim 12, 24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Robbins (US 6,326,978).

As to claim 36, note the discussion of Robertson above, Robertson does not teach the window manipulation mechanism is configured to: rotate the window so that window controls on the edge of the window become visible in response to a cursor moving close to an edge of a window; receive the command through a window control; and to rotate the window back to its original orientation. Robbins teaches wherein receiving the command involves:

rotating the window [Fig. 2] so that window controls [Robbins item 12] on the edge of the window [Robbins item 10] become visible in response to a cursor moving close to an edge of a window [column 4 lines 1-4]; receiving the command through a window control [Robbins item 28]; and rotating the window back to its original orientation [Robbins column 3 lines 46-52]. This reads on the claimed invention therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the window rotation as taught by Robbins with the 3D window manipulation as taught by Robertson because the user may receive information that is not oriented as the user needs or desires and with a method of this type, selectively rotating windows would provide a more manageable computer interface; [Robbins column 2 lines 23-29].

Claim 12 differ from claim 36 only in that claim 12 is a method claim of the same apparatus as claim 36. Thus, claim 12 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 36 above.

Claim 24 differ from claim 36 only in that claim 24 is directed to a computer readable storage medium storing instructions that when executed by a computer cause to perform the same method as claim 36. Thus, claim 24 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 36 above.

As to claim 36, it is an apparatus claim of claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4-6, 16-18, and 28-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior

art of records either singularly or in combination fail to teach where in when the

backside of the window is shown, displaying information associated with the

2D application on the backside of the window.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later

than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should

preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly

labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

9.The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Conrad et al (US 5,680,562) teaches manipulation of a

display window. Boeuf (US 7,007,241) teaches a focus buoy to locate windows.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Joshua Pender whose telephone number is

571-270-1045. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30am -

5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application

may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR)

system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance

from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

JP

Joshua Pender

7/10/06   2179

CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER